

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

ATTY. DOCKET : RM.CH5  
APPLICANT : Symington, *et al.*  
US SERIAL NO. : 10/539,923  
US ENTRY DATE : February 21, 2006  
PCT SERIAL NO. : PCT/US03/01943  
INT'L FILING DATE : December 16, 2003

Examiner : Benjamin J. Packard  
Art Unit : 1612  
Conf. No. : 90068399

**Election/Restrictions**

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicant's election, without traverse, of claims 1-8 (Group I), and election of EUDRAGIT RS 30 D brand polymethylmethacrylate (claim 3) which is a type of ammonio methacrylate copolymer, type B USP/NF as set forth in generic claim 2, plasticizer triethyl citrate (claims 4 and 5).

Claims 9-18 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § .142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, by the Examiner as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because Claim 3 contains the trademark/trade name "EUDRAGIT RS 30 D."

According to the Examiner, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim, as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In this regard, the Examiner directs Applicants' attention to *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The Examiner states that the claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a specific formulation of polymethylmethacrylate copolymer and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

**APPLICANTS' RESPONSE**

M.P.E.P §608.01(v) states that the use of trademarks to identify products is acceptable provided the definition of the product is established in the specification by a definition, and the

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

ATTY. DOCKET : RM.CH5  
APPLICANT : Symington, *et al.*  
US SERIAL NO. : 10/539,923  
US ENTRY DATE : February 21, 2006  
PCT SERIAL NO. : PCT/US03/01943  
INT'L FILING DATE : December 16, 2003

Examiner : Benjamin J. Packard  
Art Unit : 1612  
Conf. No. : 90068399

product is well-known and defined in the literature. In fact, Appendix I of the M.P.E.P. provides a partial list trademarks that are known and acceptable for use in patent applications.

The EUDRAGIT family of polymethylmethacrylate coating lacquers, produced by Rohm Pharma, are well-known in the art for use as excipients in sustained release and transdermal drug delivery systems, and comply with the US Pharmacopia and National Formulary. Therefore, the composition marketed under the EUDRAGIT trademark is sufficiently defined and definite to meet the requirements of the patent law and related regulations. More specifically, Applicant has provided in the specification a definition of the product and a cite to the Rohm Pharma website that sets forth the composition and characteristics of this particular EUDRAGIT compound. See, page 2, lines 24-25, particularly line 33; page 5, lines 19-27. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that the use of EUDRAGIT RS 30D as a trademark in claim 3 does not render the identification or specification of the claimed composition to be indefinite.

In addition to the foregoing, it is specified in the claims themselves, specifically dependent claim 3, that the ammonio methacrylate copolymer is EUDRAGIT RS 30 D brand polymethylmethacrylate. Thus, Applicants are not baldly identifying the copolymer by a trademark, but instead is identifying the trademark product as "ammonio methacrylate copolymer" and as a "polymethylmethacrylate." Thus, the identification of a well-known trademark (EUDRAGIT) in the specification, and the additional specification of the trademarked material in the claims themselves renders Applicants' use of the mark to be acceptable and within the guidelines established in M.P.E.P §608.01(v) and therefore in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the Examiner's rejection of dependent claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

ATT'Y. DOCKET : RM.CH5  
APPLICANT : Symington, *et al.*  
US SERIAL NO. : 10/539,923  
US ENTRY DATE : February 21, 2006  
PCT SERIAL NO. : PCT/US03/01943  
INT'L FILING DATE : December 16, 2003

Examiner : Benjamin J. Packard  
Art Unit : 1612  
Conf. No. : 90068399

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*****CLAIMS 1-8**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as specifying subject matter considered by the Examiner to be anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,286,497 issued to Hendrickson, *et al.* (hereinafter "Hendrickson, *et al.*").

The Examiner states that the Hendrickson, *et al.* reference discloses a method of making a polymeric formulation comprising a mixture of water, EUDRAGIt RS 30 D and plasticizer (see, Col. 12, lines 46-58). Among the disclosed plasticizers is triethyl citrate. The amount plasticizer utilized can vary, but will typically be present in the amount of 0 to 40 w/w %, and more preferably about 5-15 w/w % (Col. 7, lines 16-28). Further, the Examiner alleges that with respect to the plasticizer, triethyl citrate, where selection of one named species from a list of alternatives is all that is required to arrive at the instantly claimed subject matter, that species is anticipated, citing Ex Parte A., 17 USPQ2d 1716 (Bd. Pat. App. Inter. 1990); In re Sivaramakrishnan, 213 USPQ 441 (CCPA 1982).

The Examiner points out that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, the Examiner contends that the intended use of an inert coating to serve as a temporary mechanical barrier on top of a temporary coating of pharmaceutically-active substance applied to the surface of a tooth appears to be met where the prior art teaches the polymeric formation as a coating for an active substance. The physical properties, such as viscosity, would have been reasonably expected to be inherent, given that the concentration of components of the disclosed solution appear to be of substantially the same range as those disclosed in the instant specification.

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

ATT'Y. DOCKET : RM.CH5  
APPLICANT : Symington, *et al.*  
US SERIAL NO. : 10/539,923  
US ENTRY DATE : February 21, 2006  
PCT SERIAL NO. : PCT/US03/01943  
INT'L FILING DATE : December 16, 2003

Examiner : Benjamin J. Packard  
Art Unit : 1612  
Conf. No. : 90068399

**APPLICANTS' RESPONSE**

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to specify a system of a coating applied over a pharmacologically-active substance that is itself installed to be in direct communication with a surface of a tooth of a patient. Nothing in the Hendrickson, *et al.* reference teaches or suggests this combination of elements.

In view of the foregoing, independent claim 1 is respectfully asserted by Applicant to specify subject matter that is patentable distinguishable over the teaching in the Hendrickson, *et al.* reference. Claims 2-8, which are also subject to this rejection, all depend from amended independent claim 1 and therefore contain all of the limitations therein. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been overcome.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as specifying subject matter considered by the Examiner to be obvious over the Hendrikson, *et al.* reference.

The Examiner argues that, assuming that the prior art differs from the instant claims insofar as it does not suggest the composition as a preferred embodiment, it still would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to pick and choose among the disclosed plasticizers, where the various options are disclosed, to provide the same physical property to the solution.

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE**

As noted above, independent claim 1 has been amended to specify subject matter that is neither taught or suggested by the Hendrikson, *et al.* reference, or any of the references of record, irrespective of whether they are viewed singularly or in combination. Dependent claims 2-8 depend from amended independent claim 1, and therefore contain all of the limitations therein. In addition, dependent claims 2-8 have been amended to specify proper antecedent basis in conformance with the amendments herein made to independent claim 1. Accordingly,

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

ATTY. DOCKET : RM.CH5  
APPLICANT : Symington, et al.  
US SERIAL NO. : 10/539,923  
US ENTRY DATE : February 21, 2006  
PCT SERIAL NO. : PCT/US03/01943  
INT'L FILING DATE : December 16, 2003

Examiner : Benjamin J. Packard  
Art Unit : 1612  
Conf. No. : 90068399

it is respectfully asserted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the present application, allow the claims, and pass the application for issue. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution of this case can be expedited by a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to call attorney for Applicant at the telephone number indicated hereinbelow.

Respectfully submitted,



Benita J. Rohm  
Reg. No. 28,664  
Rohm & Monsanto, P.L.C.  
12 Rathbone Place  
Grosse Pointe, MI 48230  
Telephone (313) 884-4805  
Telecopier (313) 884-4806

RAM:rb:ROA.CH5

enc Annexure 1 - Claims Rewritten to Show Amendments  
File: ROA.CH5